

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SCOTT RICHARD PRICE,

No. 2:22-cv-0202 DB P

Plaintiff,

ORDER AND

v.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

RCCC, et al.,

Defendants.

By order filed September 9, 2022, plaintiff's complaint was screened and found not to state a cognizable claim. The court granted plaintiff thirty days leave to file an amended complaint. The thirty day period has expired, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint or otherwise responded to the court's order.

Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court shall assign a district judge to this case.

////

In addition, IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections with the court. The document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time waives the right to appeal the District Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

Dated: November 3, 2022

DLB7  
pric0202.fta.nca



DEBORAH BARNES  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE